

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 11-23 are pending in the instant application. Claims 12-23 were previously withdrawn under 37 C.F.R. 1.142(b) pursuant to a restriction requirement, leaving claims 1-6 and 11 for examination. Claims 1-6 and 11 have been rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1 and 3-6 have been amended. The above amendments made herein after final rejection are proper and should be entered, as they are made solely for the purpose of placing the application in condition for allowance or in better condition for appeal. The Applicants submit that claims 1-6 and 11 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections. No new matter has been entered.

Support for the Amendments

Support for the amendment to claims 1 and 3-6 may be found throughout the Applicants' specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. In particular, support may be found, e.g., on page 6, lines 14-25 (host system computer executing programs 104, 106, 108, 110, 112, 113, and 114 – i.e., logic), page 7, lines 21-22 (host system computer may be a mainframe computer), page 18, lines 12-22 (demand conditioning system implements the processes described in flow diagrams of Figures 4 and 5), and Figure 1.

No new matter has been entered by these amendments.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §101

Claims 1-6 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being unstatutory for failing to be tied to another statutory class or transforming underlying subject matter to a different state or thing. Claims 1 and 3-6 have been amended to recite features implemented by logic executing on a host system computer. In particular, independent claim1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, “identifying, ***via logic executing on a host system computer***, at least one excess component inventory liability or at least one constraint in supply capability for an end product by matching

current buying patterns for said end product against inventory liability and supply capability based on a previous demand forecast;

reducing, *via the logic*, supply liability for the excess component inventory liability or the constraint in supply capability for an end product using a time-phased approach that begins at 100 percent liability assessment and includes a series of mitigation activities performed over time until the supply liability reaches a specified percentage level.”

Dependent claims 3-6 have been similarly amended. The amendments to claims 1 and 3-6 tie the processes recited therein to a different statutory class; namely, a system/apparatus. Accordingly, claims 1-6 and 11 are believed to be statutory pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 101. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance is requested. It is submitted that the foregoing amendments and remarks should render the case in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment, or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicants' Attorneys

By: /Marisa J. Dubuc/
Marisa J. Dubuc
Registration No. 46,673
Customer No. 48915

Date: March 25, 2010

Address: 20 Church Street, 22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103-3207
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115